



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/578,107	05/24/2000	Satoshi Kawase	JP9-1999-0099-US1	4769

25259 7590 07/17/2003

IBM CORPORATION
3039 CORNWALLIS RD.
DEPT. T81 / B503, PO BOX 12195
REASEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709

EXAMINER

ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/578,107

Applicant(s)

KAWASE ET AL.

Examiner

David E. England

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 10-12 and 14-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 10-12 and 14-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3, 4
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 3, 10 – 12, and 14 – 16 are presented for examination.

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1 and 14 are objected to because of the following informalities: The term “costumer-side” is misspelled. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - a. The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
3. Claims 1, 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The limitation of sending said HTTP message in an unedited form to the customer-side browser, is not in the specifically stated in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2143

5. Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 14, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jawahar et al. U.S. Patent No. 6298356 (hereinafter Jawahar)

6. Referencing claim 1, Jawahar teaches an information processing method in an information processing system having an information terminal support server which supports collaboration of a browser loaded on a customer-side information terminal and a browser loaded on an agent-side information terminal, the method comprising the steps of:

7. (a) receiving, at the information terminal support server, an HTTP message sent in response to a customer-side browser request, (e.g. col. 11, line 60 – col. 12, line 64);

8. (b) determining whether or not said HTTP message agrees with a predetermined condition, (e.g. col. 2, line 15 – 60 & col. 7, line 19 – col. 8, line 6);

9. (c) editing contents of said HTTP message when said HTTP message agrees with said predetermined condition, (e.g. col. 7, line 19 – col. 8, line 6 & col. 19, lines 39 – 69);

10. (d) sending said HTTP message in an unedited form to the customer-side browser, (e.g. col. 10, line 1 – col. 11, line 48); and

11. (e) sending said HTTP message in an edited form to the agent-side browser, (e.g. col. 10, line 1 – col. 11, line 48).

12. Referencing claim 2, Jawahar teaches editing is carried out to insert a command for a client program loaded on the agent-side information terminal, (e.g. col. 19, lines 11 – 50).

13. Claims 10, 11, 14, 15 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 3, 12, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jawahar (6298356).

16. As per claim 3, as interpreted by the examiner, Jawahar does not specifically teach said command is one of "form submit prohibition", "form alteration prohibition", "concealment of specific form" or "concealment of specific field".

Official Notice is taken that it was a common practice to insert command that are of similar nature to "form submit prohibition", "form alteration prohibition", "concealment of specific form" or "concealment of specific field" at the time the instant invention was made.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Jawahar to insert command that are of similar nature to "form submit prohibition", "form alteration prohibition", "concealment of specific form" or "concealment of specific field" using the teaching of common practice. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to add the limitation of insert command "form submit prohibition", "form alteration prohibition", "concealment of specific form" or "concealment of specific field" because it would be more efficient to insert commands that would be utilized in the filtering of HTTP messages that could have information that is not to be divulged to the customer-side browser.

Art Unit: 2143

17. Claims 12 and 16 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

19. a. Bakshi et al. U.S. Patent No. 6311215 discloses System for dynamic determination of client communications capabilities.

20. b. Pacifici et al. U.S. Patent No. 6230171 discloses Markup system for shared HTML documents.

21. c. Lim et al. U.S. Patent No. 6434619 discloses Internet-enabled service management system and method.

22. d. Gutfreund et al. U.S. Patent No. 6192394 discloses Inter-program synchronous communications using a collaboration software system.

23. e. Griffin U.S. Patent No. 6237005 discloses Web server mechanism for processing multiple transactions in an interpreted language execution environment.

24. f. Appleman et al. U.S. Patent No. 6336132 discloses Internet resource location system with identified and approved human guides assigned to specific topics to provide content related to the topic.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 703-305-5333. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are none for regular communications and none for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2143

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is none.

David E. England
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

De



July 11, 2003



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100